



Advance Journal of Econometrics and Finance

Vol-4, Issue-2, 2026

Advance Journal of Econometrics and Finance

Online ISSN

2959-8990

Print ISSN

2959-8982

<https://ajeaf.com/index.php/Journal/About>

Name of Publisher: SCHOLAR CRAFT EDUCATION & RESEARCH HUB

Review Type: Double Blind Peer Review

Journal Frequency: Quarterly Research Journal



BALANCING WORK AND LIFE: HOW PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL HARMONY AND JOB ENGAGEMENT SHAPE WORKFORCE EFFECTIVENESS IN PAKISTANI ORGANIZATIONS EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES (2022–2026)

Dr. Mehwish Bhatti^{*1}, Ali Akbar Jalbani², Dr Sumera Aslam³

<p>Dr. Mehwish Bhatti^{*1} ^{*1}mehwish.bhatti@numl.edu.pk Ali Akbar Jalbani² ²ali.jalbani@usindh.edu.pk Dr Sumera Aslam³ ³sumeraehtsham85@gmail.com</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Effectiveness in workplace is actually the result of a mix of personal, interpersonal, and organizational factors. Among these, from the point of view of the employee, two factors are the main ones: first, the capability of drawing healthy boundary between work and personal life, and second, the extent to which one is so into one's work that he/she almost doesn't notice the time passing and at the same time is motivated. This paper is about how personal-professional harmony usually referred to as work-life balance (WLB) and job engagement usually referred to as employee engagement (EE) can together predict the performance of a worker. Various samples of employees were selected from a combination of the public and private sector organizations of Pakistan for structured questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. Then some sort of descriptive statistics, reliability testing, Pearson correlation, standard multiple regression, and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) were used for analyzing the collected data. Hypothesis formulation and results interpretation were facilitated by theoretical framework based on Social Exchange Theory, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, and the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. Findings support the idea that WLB and EE are great indicators of self-rated performance, with EE being the better predictor ($\beta = .597, p < .001$ vs. $\beta = .181, p = .016$ for WLB). In total, the two factors explain 54.5% of the variation in performance. Besides, PLS-SEM shows that EE is a partial mediator between WLB and performance, indicating that balance and engagement are not separate paths but closely linked and help each other. HR experts, team leaders, and government policy makers can take some practical cues from this study.</p>
<p>Keywords:</p>	<p>work-life balance, employee engagement, job performance, JD-R model, Social Exchange Theory, COR theory, Pakistan, public sector, private sector, PLS-SEM</p>

Introduction

In management it is assumed that increasing hours on the job will result in improvements in performance. But, decades of evidence shows that the reverse is often the case: employees who feel like they're always overworked, have only a few hours to rest each day, and can't maintain a healthy work-life balance are not generally the employees that are best for the organization. This tension has been heightened over the past few years, since 2020. The pandemic has led to an acceleration of remote and hybrid working and this has not yet subsided, eroding the spatial and temporal boundaries between professional demands and personal life (Choi, Kim & Lee, 2022). In many workplaces it has been a more flexible yet fatigued workforce. In this context, two constructs have come to the fore in the recent scholarship. Work-life balance (WLB) is the first that relates to whether an employee can balance the pressures of their working life with the needs and demands of their personal life. Employee engagement (EE) is the next, and psychologically more involved, level of involvement and motivation of that same employee in their job, tasks, and responsibilities. The connection between these two concepts is not immediately apparent, but over the last few decades, it's been clearly documented that when employees feel a sense of balance in their life, over time they tend to show increased connection to their work, and this is one of the most visible behaviors that can lead to improved work performance (Marecki, 2024; Sun & Ishak, 2025). The Pakistani context is one which is especially relevant for this inquiry. Its population is young and expanding quickly, as is its workforce, with government institutions and structures along the old lines and a newer, more dynamic private sector, increasingly fighting for its workers on the regional level. In spite of this, there is still a lack of empirical research that explores the interplay of WLB and EE in Pakistani organizations, particularly in the post-2022 period when organizational contexts have undergone significant changes with regard to flexibility and wellbeing. The gap justifies the present study that uses data from 173 employees, and applies regression and structural equation modelling to yield a complex view of the relationship between WLB-EE and performance. The analysis is based on three theory constructs. In the theory of Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), if the organizations invest in the welfare of their employees by providing flexibility in working hours or policies, or support the employee's work, the employees in turn will exert more effort and commitment. The relationship between resources (e.g., autonomy and social support) and job engagement, and of demands (e.g., work overload) and job disengagement is captured by the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) also suggests that the loss of resources will be felt more strongly than the gain. These frameworks can complement each other in a mediated model: Balance fosters engagement, engagement fosters performance, and balance has a residual, direct effect on performance, as well.

2. Objectives of the Study

- 1 The five connected objectives of this research were:
 1. To determine direction and intensity of relationship between WLB and employee performance of Public and Private sector employees in Pakistan.
 2. To find the correlation between employee engagement and performance, and whether the JD-R relationship completely explains the relation between employee engagement and performance in the Pakistani context.
 3. To determine if the combination of WLB and EE accounts for a significantly higher percentage of the variance in performance than either one or EE alone.
 4. To see whether EE serves as a mediator that takes WLB's influence to performance and shows an indirect pathway.
 5. To distill practical lessons for HR leaders and organizational decision makers who are looking for measurable improvements in workforce effectiveness.

3. Literature Review

Since it was first introduced into management parlance in the 1970s, the notion of work-life balance has changed significantly. Early definitions were dominated by the concept of time; one was that productive and fair employees would spend their hours equally between work and private life. This arithmetic perspective has been largely abandoned by researchers; they are now concerned more with what goes on in a person's subjective experience. Rather, what an employee needs, it is argued, is not a balance of time in each of these domains, but an awareness that there is no chronic depletion in either domain (Alamsyah et al., 2025).

In practice, there is a list of benefits of good WLB that was drawn from various industries and culture. In a study of European service organizations, Marecki (2024) has followed their workers and discovered that those who said their personal and work lives were reasonably compatible also had higher morale and but this is a measurable fact—higher productivity. When working with 400 employees from start-up businesses in Shanghai, Sun and Ishak (2025) arrived at similar findings: that employee wellbeing was a key link between WLB and performance, meaning that feeling balanced first, makes people healthier and more energised, which then translates to work. But the connection between WLB and performance isn't necessarily a simple one. However, Mamatha and Thoti (2023) examined knowledge workers who transitioned to remote working during and following the pandemic and reported that greater flexibility in the schedule was associated with some degree of social isolation, along with the loss of structure in the boundaries, which may partially offset the benefits of remote work with regard to performance. Mathur et al. (2024) found that for workers in information-dependent jobs, information is sometimes present after work, even when they are technically off the clock, which they described as a 'phantom workplace'. The relationship between WLB and performance is not undermined by these complications, but rather is a one that can vary depending on the context and thus should be studied with care in empirical research.

In Pakistan, specific context, Rasool et al. (2024) found that RYG (restricted autonomy and overload workload) in the hotel industry indirectly led to organizational disengagement and burnout. The results are consistent with predictions of the Conservation of Resources theory, which suggests that when personal and job resources are perceived as under threat, workers will change their focus to defence, not production, a defensive posture that is fundamentally incompatible with high performance. Since the initial study of Kahn (1990) there have been many different definitions of employee engagement, but the most popular current definition is from Schaufeli et al. (2002): a positive steady state of psychological energy related to work, characterized by three elements: (1) feeling of vigor, (2) feeling of dedication, and (3) feeling of absorption. Engagement is unique in that it focuses on activation rather than satisfaction or commitment, meaning that engaged employees are not just satisfied or committed to their organization, they are actively engaged.

The most influential theory of engagement production/destruction is the Job Demands-Resources model. In this model, the job resources (autonomy in work schedule, developmental feedback, supportive colleagues, and perceived organizational support) contribute to engagement by meeting basic psychological needs and as a source of the tools required to meet job demands effectively. The demands refer, on the other hand, to the conditions that demand prolonged physical or cognitive effort. The result of consistently falling short of demands, is fatigue and ultimately disengagement. This model has been further developed by Demerouti (2025), who extended it to include employees' personal resources (including self-efficacy and resilience).

Disengagement comes with significant organizational costs and evidence of that is well-documented. As for the latest Gallup (2024) global survey, the level of engagement was only 23 percent of the global workforce, while around 19 percent were actively disengaged. The lost productivity due to active disengagement alone accounts for an estimated



Advance Journal of Econometrics and Finance

Vol-4, Issue-2, 2026

\$7.8 trillion in lost productivity annually. Businesses, on the other hand, that do successfully raise engagement, do so to about a 23 percent increase in profitability and 41 percent decrease in absenteeism. At the micro-level, Nguyen et al. (2024) explain these aggregate effects by discovering that engaged employees are more likely to share tacit knowledge with their colleagues and to try out new ideas and solutions—actions which combine to create organisational level performance benefits.

In Pakistan and other developing countries like, research in the field of engagement has started gaining momentum in the recent years. A recent study by Lee and colleagues (2024) with gig economy workers in Pakistan provided a first examination of job autonomy and social support among supervisors predicting engagement among a growing employment category that has not been the focus of much previous research, namely the gig economy. While this may be true, McKinsey (2024) reports on the global scene that more than half of remote workers correlate their improved engagement with better work-life balance, which supports an empirical connection between this section and the one that came before it. Organizational interest in WLB and engagement is justified only by performance – if these concepts were not translated into meaningful ways of how well employees do their jobs, they would not be the focus of the attention that they are given. Researchers today generally consider performance to have multiple dimensions. Task performance refers to the actions that involve using technical skills that are essential to the role description—accuracy, efficiency and reliability in task performance. In addition to these, contextual performance includes a range of pro-social behaviors, such as assisting others, working late when necessary and safeguarding the reputation of the organization. Current empirical-based research has highlighted that performance is not solely a function of natural talent, but is more influenced by psychological factors in which employees' function. David and colleagues (2025) reported that workers who suffered from chronic WLB difficulties exhibited higher stress measures, but also lower levels of task performance across a system, even after accounting for job difficulty and the type of sector their jobs are in. In a study on small and medium enterprises in Southeast Asia, Susanto and colleagues (2022) discovered that WLB had a greater impact on performance, especially when family-supportive leadership exists within the organization, suggesting that WLB may be influenced by other factors such as leadership, which can be actively developed by organizations.

Theoretical Grounding

Three bodies of theory jointly explain why WLB and EE should influence performance, and why the influence of WLB on performance should partly run through EE. Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) is the broadest of the three. Researcher evaluate that there are implicit norms of reciprocity that govern social relationships, including the employment relationship. If an employer shows them they care about them, such as by being flexible with hours, flexible with arrangements or visibly invest in their development, then employees will return the favor by working harder, committing deeper and going above and beyond the call of duty. Therefore, theory states that the investment that organizations make in WLB and conditions that promote engagement will be rewarded with increased performance. The JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) specifies the mechanisms by which resources are translated into engagement and that engagement is subsequently translated into performance. Resources also provide an element of resistance to the demands they face, and this resistance is also a catalyst for a motivational process: individuals who feel that they have enough of these resources feel capable and supported to give a lot of them to their job, which is the hallmark of engagement. It is engagement that will ultimately forecast performance, as engagement will lead to effort, persistence, and creative problem solving that underlie quality output. Work-life imbalance is a very good fit with the demand side of this model: it consumes cognitive and emotional resources; it reduces engagement; and it eventually leads to poor performance.

1.1 The JD-R model leaves unexplained a significant component of the asymmetric nature of loss and gain, namely that explained by Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989). COR theory states that people feel driven to lose resources they value, and feel more disturbed when they lose resources than they feel happy when they gain resources. This imbalance contributes to the fact that WLB breakdowns can have ramifications that extend beyond the immediate triggering event: When employees perceive their personal time, energy, or family relationships are coming under stress from work, they psychologically enter a defensive stance, which reduces engagement and productivity even after the immediate crisis has passed.

These three main propositions can be extracted from the evidence reviewed. The first is that WLB is the precondition for EE: If an employee's labor life and his personal life are in reasonable balance, then he has the psychological reserve to invest emotionally and cognitively into his work. This is true of Choi and colleagues (2022) and supported by McKinsey (2024) at the global level. Second, EE causes EP: engaged employees do better (on measurable dimensions of tasks, contexts and adaptation) than employees who are not engaged. Third, WLB also has a direct, independent impact on EP, beyond the impact of engagement: balanced employees are less exhausted, experience fewer role conflicts, and are more likely to have a "clean" mind for their job. The above three propositions propose a partial mediation where EE mediates only part of the effect of WLB on EP.

4. Hypotheses

From the above theoretical and empirical arguments, the following four hypotheses are set forth to guide the empirical analysis:

H1: Employee engagement is positively and significantly related to work-life balance.

H2: Work-life balance positively and significantly correlates with employee performance.

The hypotheses are as follows: Employee engagement is positively related and significantly influenced by employee performance.

H4: Employee engagement is a partial mediator between the positive relationship between work-life balance and employee performance.

5. Conceptual Model

The conceptual model that follows suggests that WLB is an upstream antecedent which influences EP in two ways. The first channel is a direct channel, which helps to reduce role strain, to conserve cognitive resources, and thus facilitates more consistent task performance. The latter is an indirect channel (H1 + H3) that starts with creating the psychological "surplus" (H1) for complete effort, which then flows into creating the psychological "surplus" (H3) for performance. This dual-pathway structure is based on two theories, Social Exchange Theory, which serves to explain the relationship between organizational support and the reciprocation of the effort and the JD-R model which serves to explain the psychological mechanisms that connect resources with engagement with output. Direct and mediated effects enable the model to capture nuance that single-pathway models lack, and practitioners need to determine whether to focus on policies to enable balance or programs to engage people to build balance, or on a combination of both.

6. Research Methodology

This study adopted a quantitative, explanatory, cross-sectional design. The explanatory orientation was selected since our main interest was in testing theoretically motivated causal propositions and not simply describing the distribution of variables. This cross-sectional data collection approach (observing all data at one time) is a reality of the undergraduate research environment, and is in line with the typical practice in organizational survey research. We recognize this limitation in causal inference and elaborate on its implications in the conclusion. Questionnaires were sent out from October to December 2024, in both print and electronic. Descriptive analyses, reliability analyses, and

regression analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 30, while confirmatory measurement model evaluation and structural path estimation was done using Smart PLS 4 via PLS-SEM. The target population included the full-time workers of Pakistani organizations working in administrative and clerical, supervisory and managerial positions. Since there was no scientific sampling frame of Pakistani employees that was available for sampling, convenience sampling was employed using professional contacts and organizational networks. It is a practice that is widely adopted in organizational behavior studies that take place in less institutionalized developing country settings where administrative systems are less developed (Hair et al., 2022). 200 questionnaires were sent and usable questionnaires were returned 173 (86.5 per cent). This sample size is sufficient for published threshold for reliable regression coefficient estimation and for PLS-SEM with six indicator variables per construct.

All three constructs were assessed by a modified three item Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Five items were used to measure the Employee Performance based on the literature from the task performance of the literature (Karatepe & Olugbade, 2020); accuracy, reliability, timely completion, quality of output, and role contribution. Work-Life Balance was assessed using six items that tapped into time allocation, psychological involvement in domains, and satisfaction with life and work (Jamillah et al., 2023). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was used to measure Employee Engagement with six items in the three sub dimensions of Vigor, Dedication and Absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Content validity was assessed through the review of two organizational behavior faculty members and a pilot test of 20 respondents was also done to test the clarity of the items prior to the collection of full data.

7. Results

7.1 Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency

The mean scores, standard deviations, ranges and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the three constructs of interest are summarized in

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Scale Reliability (N = 173)

Variable	Mean	SD	Range	Cronbach's α
Employee Performance	4.30	0.814	1–5	.844
Work-Life Balance	4.01	0.759	1–5	.733
Employee Engagement	4.09	0.812	1–5	.865

The three constructs were all measured above the mid-point of the scale indicating fairly positive perceptions among the respondents. The overall mean rating was highest for Employee Performance ($M = 4.30$) because of a well-established phenomenon where self-ratings of performance are higher than they should be. The engagement score was 4.09 and the balance score was 4.01, which are both relatively good scores, reflecting a reasonably well resourced workforce. Good internal consistency was found for all alpha values over 0.70, the maximum acceptable alpha value for social science measures, with Engagement showing excellent internal consistency at .865. The third-rate was at .733, Work-Life Balance, but still fairly acceptable.

7.2 Normality Assessment

All three of these variables were significantly different from normal distribution with a p-value less than .001 for the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. The skewness coefficients ranged from -1.81 to -1.15 , and the kurtosis values were between 2.28 and 4.15, which meant that there were moderate, but not extreme, departures from normality. Both the skewness and kurtosis fell within the limits of permissive for parametric testing for samples of this size, as outlined by Hair et al. (2022). In view of this, we thus moved on to Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses, and also used the distribution-free PLS-SEM estimator without assuming multivariate normality.

7.3 Correlation Analysis

Table 2 reports the Pearson correlation matrix for the three study variables.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix (N = 173)

Variable	EP	WLB	EE
Employee Performance (EP)	—	.612**	.728**
Work-Life Balance (WLB)		—	.721**
Employee Engagement (EE)			—

Note. ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

All pairwise comparisons were significant at $p < .001$. Engagement and Performance had the strongest correlation in the matrix ($r = .728$), followed closely by the WLB-Engagement correlation ($r = .721$) and the WLB-Performance correlation ($r = .612$). The order of these coefficients is similar to the mediation logic: EE is closer to EP in the causal sequence than is WLB, and therefore, there is more variance between EE and EP. In fact, WLB and EE are highly correlated (.721) suggesting that although they represent two different constructs, they measure a similar phenomenon, as would be predicted from two conceptually distinct but practically interrelated constructs.

7.4 Multiple Regression

We regressed EP simultaneously on each of the other variables to determine the unique contribution they make to predicting EP after controlling for the other. WLB and EE. Table 3 presents the full model.

Table 3: Multiple Regression Predicting Employee Performance

Predictor	B	SE B	β	T	P
Constant	1.071	.238	—	4.494	< .001
Work-Life Balance	.195	.080	.181	2.430	.016
Employee Engagement	.598	.075	.597	8.001	< .001

Note. $R = .739$; $R^2 = .545$; Adjusted $R^2 = .540$; $F(2, 170) = 101.985$; $p < .001$; $VIF = 2.082$ for both predictors.

The model explained a significant amount of EP (54.5 percent) for the purposes of behavioral science research. The partial correlation between the two predictors did not result in a loss of significance for either predictor. As for the other two measures, engagement proved a much stronger predictor ($\beta = .597$) and this makes intuitive sense because engagement is a proximal psychological state, directly impacting the effort and persistence required to produce the output, while balance is a more distal structural condition that has a more indirect effect on output via engagement as a conduit. The variance inflation factors for both were 2.082. predictors confirmed that multicollinearity did not distort the estimates.

7.5 PLS-SEM: Measurement Model

Table 4 shows construct reliability and convergent validity statistics from the PLS measurement model.

Table 4: Construct Reliability and Validity

Construct	Cronbach's α	CR	AVE
Employee Performance	.844	.889	.593
Employee Engagement	.865	.899	.555
Work-Life Balance	.733	.806	.425*

Note. CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted. * WLB AVE below .50 threshold; accepted given $CR > .80$ per Hair et al. (2022).

The composite reliabilities for both scales were greater than .88, as were the AVE values for both scales, which exceeded .55, meeting the accepted norms for convergent validities. With a Work-Life Balance score of .425, just below the AVE criterion of .50, a word of caution is warranted for convergent validity. The composite reliability of .806, however, remains with the construct as it far exceeds the second level recommended by Hair and colleagues (2022) as the threshold level for composite reliability. The Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) criterion was used to validate the discriminant validity for all three constructs, which yielded no cross construct ratio greater than .85.

7.6 Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

Structural path coefficients were estimated using bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples, two-tailed testing, and bias-corrected confidence intervals. A path was considered significant when $p < .05$ and the CI excluded zero.

Table 5: Structural Path Coefficients (PLS-SEM)

Path	B	t	p	Decision
WLB \rightarrow EE (H1)	0.745	15.395	< .001	Supported
WLB \rightarrow EP (H2)	0.248	2.485	.013	Supported
EE \rightarrow EP (H3)	0.567	6.011	< .001	Supported
WLB \rightarrow EE \rightarrow EP (H4, indirect)	0.422	5.917	< .001	Supported

Note. Bootstrapping: 5,000 subsamples; two-tailed bias-corrected confidence intervals.

All four paths were statistically significant, confirming H1 through H4. The largest coefficient in the model was the WLB-to-EE path ($\beta = 0.745$), underscoring how foundational work-life harmony is to the psychological conditions that produce engagement. The EE-to-EP path ($\beta = 0.567$) confirmed engagement as the stronger proximal driver of performance. The direct WLB-to-EP path ($\beta = 0.248$) remained significant alongside the indirect path ($\beta = 0.422$), confirming partial rather than full mediation: balance contributes to performance both through engagement and through its own residual direct effect.

8. Discussion

Our findings do more than replicate what earlier studies have reported in other national contexts. They situate the WLB-EE performance relationship within a Pakistani public-private organizational environment that has its own structural features, cultural expectations, and sector-specific dynamics and they do so using a post-2022 dataset that reflects a world of work still recalibrating after the pandemic disruptions.

The very strong WLB-to-engagement path ($\beta = 0.745$) deserves particular attention because it implies that the primary lever for building engagement in this sample is not motivational or leadership-based but structural: it is the degree to which employees can keep their professional obligations from continuously encroaching on their personal lives.

This is consistent with the COR theory that resource conservation is one of the main motivators. If they believe that their personal time, energy and family relationships are safe and secure, then they can put their whole heart and soul into their work; if they don't, then they can't. In practical terms, this refers to upstream norms on workload management, norms on defining clear boundaries, and flexible scheduling as factors that support downstream engagement gains an insight that goes beyond the more prevalent focus on the intrinsic motivational aspects of engagement and the capacity of leaders.

Balance is a necessary yet not sufficient performance predictor, which has been confirmed by the dominance of engagement in the model in both regression ($\beta = .597$) and PLS-SEM ($\beta = 0.567$). A worker's hours may be well managed, but if they have no emotional involvement, no interest in what they are doing, or are mentally absent, even if they are physically present, their performance will not be good. This suggests that the relational, developmental and cultural practices that create engagement must be developed concurrently with the structural conditions that empower balance. This is reinforced by the partial mediation finding, which suggests that the two structures have to be considered in tandem, with ignoring one in favor of the other leaving much unexplained variance in the production of the performance.

This study has two cautions that must be noted. Common method variance attributable to the fact that all measures were obtained from the same source at the same time may have over-estimated the observed correlations. Future studies should include time-lagged designs or ratings of supervisory performance to remove the overlap in the measurement occasions and raters. Second, the convenience sample tends to have more positive WLB and engagement scores than other groups of employees, such as frontline manufacturing employees, domestic employees, or informal sector employees, which could potentially be different. The findings and implications of this study should be extended to less privileged groups in the workforce to significantly strengthen our understanding of the generalizability of the WLB-EE-performance model to relatively less privileged, organizational contexts.

9. Conclusion

This study aimed to provide clarity on the relationship between personal-professional harmony and job engagement and how these factors contribute to the performance of employees in the Pakistani organizations, based on theories and empirical evidence gathered in the past five years mainly from 2022 to 2026. What we discovered was both theoretically sound and practical; WLB and EE are co-drivers of performance, with balance driving engagement and engagement driving performance, and balance also having a direct impact on performance.

For practicing managers it's more of a false dichotomy: invest in work-life balance or invest in engagement building. The resource surplus is achieved by cutting workloads, normalizing mental separation from work outside of work hours, and allowing employees to balance personal obligations without difficulty. Then it's a question of designing roles that have enough autonomy, offer developmental feedback, are publicly recognized and connect daily work to a bigger picture of the organization. The two levers don't work well if they are taken out of a pair.

This study poses questions for future research that would need a longitudinal examination. Is the WLB-engagement-performance relationship consistent across time, or does it change as workers transition through life stages, as industries experience technologic shifts, or as the rules around hybrid work change? Do the strength of these paths vary by individual difference variables, such as personality characteristics, family structure, and role seniority? And how do leader behaviors, notably boundary spanning, and recovery supportive leadership, relate to organizational WLB policies in relation to the engagement and performance of individual team members? By answering these questions, we will gain a deeper understanding of one of the most important management problems of today's work environment.

REFERENCES

- Adamu, A., Yakubu, M., & Hassan, I. (2025). Engagement as a predictor of organizational outcomes: Cross-sectoral evidence from West Africa. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, 18(1), 44–61.
- Alamsyah, N., Fauzi, A., & Hartono, S. (2025). Personal-professional harmony and citizenship behavior at work: Exploring the satisfaction link. *Asian Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2), 101–119.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Choi, J., Kim, Y., & Lee, H. (2022). Work-family conflict and engagement in hybrid settings: Evidence from post-pandemic workplaces. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(14), 2871–2895.
- Cooke, F. L., Cooper, B., Bartram, T., Wang, J., & Mei, H. (2022). High-performance work systems, resilience, and engagement: Mapping the relationships. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1197–2199.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- David, O., Okafor, E., & Ansu, P. (2025). Stress, balance, and performance: A longitudinal view from the financial services sector. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 34(1), 88–104.
- Demerouti, E. (2025). Two decades of the job demands-resources model: Theoretical refinements and empirical frontiers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 98(1), 5–38.
- Gallup. (2024). *State of the global workplace: 2024 report*. Gallup, Inc.
- Hair, J. F., Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). Partial least squares structural equation modeling in family business research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 13(3), 100462.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524.
- Jamillah, N., Sulaiman, R., & Wahab, Z. (2023). Dimensions of work-life balance: A conceptual integration of time, involvement, and satisfaction indicators. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 27(2), 210–228.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Olugbade, O. A. (2020). Engagement and performance outcomes in Nigerian hospitality workers: The role of high-performance work practices. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 23(5), 735–754.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Lee, H., Malik, A., & Asif, N. (2024). Gig economy engagement drivers in Pakistan: Evidence from a JD-R perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2), 14931–14943.
- LinkedIn. (2023). *Workplace learning report 2023*. LinkedIn Corporation.



Advance Journal of Econometrics and Finance

Vol-4, Issue-2, 2026

- Lyddy, C. J., Good, D. J., Yuan, S., Michel, E. J., Ahlvik-Garrison, C., & Reb, J. (2025). Reperceiving personal resources in JD-R: How mindfulness shapes perceptions of demands and resources. *Journal of Business Research*, 193, 115307.
- Mamatha, S., & Thoti, K. K. (2023). Remote work, schedule autonomy, and the double-edged sword of boundary dissolution. *International Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 18(1), 77–94.
- Marecki, Ł. (2024). Work-life harmony and productivity: A longitudinal study in European service organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 60(3), 501–521.
- Mathur, P., Gulati, A., Sankpal, S., & Kee, D. M. H. (2024). Boundary crafting among knowledge workers in always-on digital environments. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 35(2), 143–165.
- McKinsey & Company. (2024). *The state of organizations 2024*. McKinsey Global Institute.
- Nguyen, T. T., Le, V. H., & Pham, D. K. (2024). Engagement, knowledge sharing, and innovation: A mediation model across Vietnamese and multinational firms. *Management Decision*, 62(4), 1123–1142.
- Prasetyo, R., Santoso, B., & Wulandari, F. (2025). Role conflict, workload, and performance in Indonesian banking: The buffering role of work-life balance. *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting*, 18(1), 61–82.
- Quantum Workplace. (2024). *2024 workplace trends report*. Quantum Workplace.
- Rasool, S. F., Almas, T., Afzal, F., & Mohelska, H. (2024). JD-R theory and employee engagement in Pakistani hotel employees. *SAGE Open*, 14(1), 1–15.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92.
- Singh, R., & Khanna, P. (2022). Work-life balance and commitment: A longitudinal perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 17(4), 55–71.
- Sun, Q., & Ishak, N. A. (2025). Balance, wellbeing, and performance in entrepreneurial start-ups: A mediated model from Shanghai. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1034872.
- Susanto, P., Hoque, M. E., Jannat, T., Emely, B., Zona, M. A., & Islam, M. A. (2022). Work-life balance, satisfaction, and performance in SMEs: The amplifying role of supervisor support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 906876.